

The Constant

Artist's Proof 28

Forces and Constants

G derived – the hierarchy problem dissolved as a counting argument

Contents

0 – Dependency and Scope · What AP28 does, dependencies, axiom mapping, epistemic status per section, kill switches, debts, items held open, relationships. 7

2 – Three Constants, Three Axioms · **c ↔ C, ℏ ↔ B, G ↔ R, topology ↔ S. The one-to-one mapping of constants to axioms.** **11**

3 – The Faces and the Channels · **Six faces of ε (AP24) across three spatial dimensions (AP10) plus three actualisation couplings = 21 channels.** **12**

4 – The Compounding · **Independent channels couple multiplicatively. Twenty-one channels give $\alpha_{em}^{21} \approx 1.338 \times 10^{-45}$** **13**

5 – The Formal Proofs · **Five propositions: completeness of six faces, actualisation scope, coupling independence, circular cross-section, unit coupling.** **14**

6 – The Puncture – 1×ε · **The unpaired element couples through a circular puncture, weighted by 1/π. $\alpha_G = \alpha_{em}^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi)$.** **18**

7 – The Prediction · **$G = \alpha_{em}^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi) \times \hbar c/m_e^2 = 6.721 \times 10^{-11}$; discrepancy 0.69%.** **19**

8 – The Hierarchy Dissolved · **Gravity is not weaker than electromagnetism. It is wider. The ratio is the number of rooms in the building.** **20**

9 – The Unification [INTERPRETIVE] · **Quantum mechanics and general relativity as two ends of one process. Non-derivational; the formula does not depend on it.** **21**

10 – For the Reader Who Wants It in One Paragraph · The whole argument in plain language..... 23

11 – Kill Switches · KS-R.7 through KS-R.10 – eight switches in Claim/Test/Status/Recovery form. 24

12 – Dependencies · AP03, AP04/AP05, AP10, AP12, AP15, AP20, AP24, and what depends on AP28..... 27

Claim Summary · Section-by-section structural status with epistemic-status labels. 30

Conditionality Footer · Dependencies, dependents, kill switches engaged, debts owed, items held open..... 31

Notation Reference · All symbols used in AP28 with structural source and disambiguation..... 32

Artist's Note

What this paper does – and why.

This is Artist's Proof 28 of The 420 Code, in Notebook IV (Forces and Constants). Two of the three fundamental constants were already derived: c from the substrate stiffness ratio (Axiom C, AP03), $\hbar$ from Stone's theorem on the axiom-derived Hilbert space (Axiom B, AP12). The third – G, Newton's gravitational constant – is derived here, from Axiom R: the persistence of the break in the geometry of the arena. Three constants. Three axioms. One break.

The derivation is a counting argument. AP24 established that the break ε has exactly six independent faces. The arena has three spatial dimensions (AP10). Six faces across three dimensions give eighteen paired channels; the actualisation state couples to each of the three dimensions, adding three more. Twenty-one independent coupling channels. Electromagnetism couples through one channel (α_em). Gravity maintains the entire arena – all twenty-one channels simultaneously – and for independent channels simultaneous coupling is multiplicative. The gravitational coupling is therefore α_em^{21}, plus one factor of $1/\pi$ for the round hole the electron holds open.

The result is a prediction. $G = \alpha_em^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi) \times \hbar c/m_e^2$. Using CODATA values for α_em, $\hbar$, c, and m_e, this gives G_predicted = 6.721×10^{-11} N·m²/kg² against a measured 6.674×10^{-11} – a discrepancy of 0.69%. G is the least precisely measured fundamental constant in physics; laboratories scatter far beyond the formal uncertainty, and the axioms offer a structural reason (apparatus-dependent leakage, AP06). The prediction may be closer to the true value than current measurements are.

The hierarchy problem – why gravity is 10^{45} times weaker than electromagnetism – dissolves. Gravity is not weaker. It is wider. Electromagnetism is a torch beam: one channel, focused, intense. Gravity is the same light filling every room in the building: twenty-one channels, each compounding the coupling by one power of α_em. The ratio 10^{45} is not fine-tuning. It is the number of rooms in the building. The hierarchy is a floor plan.

Eight kill switches are engaged – the largest set in Notebook IV. One is empirical (KS-R.7: the prediction must agree within 1%). Seven are structural, testing the counting argument piece by piece: the channel count of 21 (KS-R.8), the completeness of six faces (KS-R.8a), the scope of actualisation couplings (KS-R.8b), channel independence (KS-R.8c), uniform per-channel coupling (KS-R.8d), the circular puncture giving $1/\pi$ (KS-R.9), and the quantum-classical unification claim (KS-R.10).

One honest boundary. Section 9 (The Unification) is interpretive, not derivational. The numerical result – the formula for G – does not depend on it. A reader may accept the formula and reject the interpretation without affecting any other result in the work. And the 1/π factor carries a sub-debt: the formal normalisation of the boundary coupling (1/π versus 1/2π versus 1/4π) is structurally motivated and supported by the 0.69% agreement, but its formal verification against the full puncture topology is owed.

the420code.org

Copyleft 2026

Orientation

Where AP28 fits

AP28 sits inside Notebook IV (Forces and Constants), Volume Ø.4 of The 420 Code. It is the capstone of the constants programme: c (AP03) and $\hbar$ (AP12) were derived earlier, and AP28 derives the third, G. It rests directly on AP24's six-face identification and AP10's three spatial dimensions – the counting argument is impossible without both. Where AP14 (The Correction) derives G's first quantum correction, AP28 derives G's value.

Downstream, AP28 feeds the ethics chain: if G is derived, the arena is fully derived; if the arena is fully derived, the actualisation state is fully derived. The constant that holds the stage open is the last structural prerequisite for the work's account of the now.

Reading order within AP28

Front to back. Section 2 maps three constants to three axioms. Section 3 builds the channel count: six faces across three dimensions plus three actualisation couplings, totalling 21. Section 4 compounds the coupling multiplicatively to α_em^{21}. Section 5 proves the five structural claims the counting rests on. Section 6 adds the 1/π puncture factor. Section 7 states the prediction and compares to measurement. Section 8 dissolves the hierarchy problem. Section 9 (interpretive) reframes quantum mechanics and general relativity as two ends of one process. Section 10 gives the one-paragraph version. Sections 11–12 list kill switches and dependencies.

If you are reading for the result only, sections 3, 4, 6, and 7 are the spine. If you are reading for rigour, section 5 (the five propositions) carries the load. If you are reading for the picture, sections 8–10 are self-contained – and section 9 is explicitly optional, affecting nothing in the formula.

How to read this paper

The paper carries two registers. The derivation is a counting argument with five formal propositions; it is meant to be checked step by step. The pictures – the torch beam and the building, the river seen from above, the floor plan – carry the metaphor stratum shared with the rest of Notebook IV and orient rather than argue.

Two things to hold while reading. First: the multiplicativity of independent channels is a mathematical fact, not a physical assumption – if independent events each have probability

p, their joint probability is p^{21} through 21 channels (Proposition 5 + Proposition 3). Second: the formula is a parameter-free prediction. Every quantity on the right (α_em, $\hbar$, c, m_e) is independently measured; nothing is fitted. The 0.69% is the test, not a tuning.

A note on notation

α_em is the fine-structure constant ≈ 1/137.036 – the per-channel coupling. α_G is the gravitational coupling $\alpha_{em}^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi)$. $\hbar$, c, m_e are the Planck constant, speed of light, and electron mass (CODATA inputs). κ is the holding limit (The Lock); $G = \alpha_G \times \hbar c/m_e^2$. ε is the break, identified with the electron (The Lock), modelled as a topological puncture (AP04/AP05).

“Channel” means an independent coupling path from the electromagnetic face to the gravitational face: a face-projection (face i in dimension j) or an actualisation coupling. There are 21. “Face” means an independent scalar reading of ε; there are six (AP24). “Actualisation state” (the now) is the surface from which records are written; it couples to the three spatial dimensions, not to the faces.

0 – Dependency and Scope

0.1 – What this paper does

AP28 derives the value of the gravitational constant G as a counting argument and states it as a parameter-free prediction. The derivation counts the independent coupling channels of the arena (§3), compounds the per-channel electromagnetic coupling multiplicatively across them (§4), proves the five structural claims the count rests on (§5), adds the geometric weight of the electron-puncture (§6), and compares the resulting formula to measurement (§7).

What the paper produces. The channel count of 21 (§3, Propositions 1–2). The compounding law α_em^{21} (§4, Propositions 3, 5). The puncture factor 1 + 1/π (§6, Proposition 4). The prediction $G = \alpha_em^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi) \times \hbar c/m_e^2$ with 0.69% discrepancy (§7). The dissolution of the hierarchy problem (§8).

What the paper does not produce. A formal verification of the 1/π normalisation against the full puncture topology of AP04/AP05 (sub-debt under KS-R.9). A derivation independent of AP24's six-face count and AP10's dimension count – both are taken as established inputs. And it does not claim the interpretive unification of §9 as a derivation; that section is explicitly optional.

0.2 – Dependencies

AP03 (The Ratio). The substrate stiffness ratio gives $c = \sqrt{(\beta/\alpha)}$. Load-bearing for the c ↔ C mapping (§2) and the fabric face (§3).

AP04 / AP05 (The Loop Hypothesis / The Break). The electron as a topological puncture connecting the broken and unbroken vacua. Load-bearing for the 1/π factor (§6, Proposition 4).

AP10 (The Dimension). Three independent spatial dimensions from the four axioms. Load-bearing for the channel count (§3): six faces × three dimensions.

AP12 (The Limit). $\hbar$ derived from Stone's theorem. Load-bearing for the $\hbar$ ↔ B mapping (§2) and the prediction (§7).

AP15 (The Connection). Phase freedom → electromagnetism; α_em as the per-channel coupling. Load-bearing for Proposition 5.

AP24 (The Residual). The six independent faces of ε. Load-bearing for the channel count and Proposition 1. AP20 (The Proof). EH and QRA proved; the axioms hold unconditionally. AP28 is unconditional on EH and QRA.

0.3 – Axiom mapping

Each fundamental constant reads one axiom.

c ↔ Axiom C (Constraint – locality). The causal bound, the maximum rate of any record. c = √(β/α), the stiffness ratio of the substrate (AP03).

ℏ ↔ Axiom B (Break – minimum). The smallest possible record. The minimum eigenvalue of the self-adjoint generator of time evolution (Stone, AP12).

G ↔ Axiom R (Record – persistence). The cost the arena pays to keep the break open. Without persistence, the crack heals, the symmetry restores, records cease. Derived in this paper.

topology ↔ Axiom S (Symmetry). Axiom S produces no constant. It produces the arena's topology – the two sectors, the mirror, the stage on which the other three constants act.

0.4 – Epistemic status per section

§2 – Three constants, three axioms – ESTABLISHED (mapping; c, ℏ derived in AP03, AP12)

§3 – Faces and channels – DERIVED (6 faces AP24 × 3 dims AP10 + 3 couplings = 21)

§4 – The compounding – DERIVED (multiplicativity of independent events)

§5 P1 – Completeness of six faces – PROVED (three-case exhaustion, no seventh reading)

§5 P2 – Actualisation scope – PROVED (couples to dimensions, not faces; 3 couplings)

§5 P3 – Coupling independence – PROVED (face + dimension independence)

§5 P4 – Circular cross-section – PROVED structurally; 1/π normalisation is a SUB-DEBT

§5 P5 – Unit coupling – PROVED (α_em is one-channel; N channels give α_em^N)

§6 – The puncture – DERIVED (1 + 1/π), conditional on the P4 normalisation

§7 – The prediction – EMPIRICAL (0.69% discrepancy; KS-R.7)

§8 – Hierarchy dissolved – STRUCTURAL CONSEQUENCE

§9 – The unification – INTERPRETIVE – NON-DERIVATIONAL (formula independent of it)

§10 – One paragraph – PLAIN-LANGUAGE SUMMARY

0.5 – Kill switch summary

Eight kill switches per the Master Kill Switch Registry: KS-R.7, KS-R.8, KS-R.8a, KS-R.8b, KS-R.8c, KS-R.8d, KS-R.9, KS-R.10. One empirical, seven structural. The largest set in Notebook IV – because the counting argument has many independent points of failure, and each is named.

KS-R.7 — G prediction. The predicted value must agree with measured G within 1% (or within the leakage correction). Current discrepancy 0.69%. Status: LIVE — EMPIRICAL.

KS-R.8 — Channel count. The exponent 21 = 6 faces × 3 dimensions + 3 actualisation couplings. Fires if the count is shown to be other than 21. Status: LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

KS-R.8a — Face completeness. Fires if a seventh independent scalar reading of ε is exhibited that is not a function of the six. Status: LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

KS-R.8b — Actualisation scope. Fires if the actualisation state couples to a degree of freedom independent of both the three dimensions and the six faces. Status: LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

KS-R.8c — Channel independence. Fires if a correlation between two channels is shown that does not reduce to shared dependence on ε. Status: LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

KS-R.8d — Uniform coupling. Fires if the per-channel coupling differs from α_{em}. Status: LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

KS-R.9 — Puncture geometry. The 1/π factor from the circular cross-section. Fires if the puncture is shown non-circular. Carries a sub-debt: the formal boundary-coupling normalisation. Status: LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

KS-R.10 — Unification structure. Fires if a system is shown where gravity does NOT maintain superposition, or electromagnetism does NOT collapse it. Status: LIVE — STRUCTURAL (and tied to the interpretive §9).

0.6 – Structural debts owed

Sub-debt under KS-R.9 – boundary-coupling normalisation. The identification of the puncture's coupling fraction as 1/π rather than 1/2π or 1/4π depends on the normalisation of the boundary coupling. The argument (Proposition 4) is structurally motivated and the 0.69% agreement supports it, but a formal verification against the full puncture topology of AP04/AP05 is owed. This is the single quantitative debt of AP28.

0.7 – Items held open without claiming debt status

The interpretive unification (§9). Whether quantum mechanics and general relativity are literally the two ends of the actualisation process, as §9 claims, is an interpretive position. It is held open and explicitly does not bear on the formula. KS-R.10 tests it; the G prediction survives its failure.

The leakage explanation of experimental scatter (§7). The claim that inter-laboratory scatter in measured G is the leakage signature (AP06) is offered as a structural explanation, not established. It is testable in principle (apparatus-dependent systematic patterns) but not yet confirmed.

0.8 – Structural relationships

Upstream: AP03 (c), AP12 ($\hbar$), AP10 (three dimensions), AP24 (six faces), AP15 (α_em as per-channel coupling), AP04/AP05 (puncture topology), AP20 (EH + QRA proved). AP28 is the third leg of the constants tripod, completing c, $\hbar$, G.

Downstream: the ethics chain. If G is derived, the arena is fully derived; if the arena is fully derived, the actualisation state is fully derived. Within Notebook IV, AP28 pairs with AP14 (G's first quantum correction): AP28 gives the value, AP14 gives the correction.

2 – Three Constants, Three Axioms

The axioms derive three fundamental constants, each from a different axiom.

c – the speed of light. Axiom C as speed. The causal bound – the maximum rate at which any record, any distinction, any piece of information can propagate. Derived from the stiffness ratio of the substrate: $c = \sqrt{(\beta/\alpha)}$, the square root of spatial stiffness divided by temporal stiffness (AP03).

$\hbar$ – the Planck constant. Axiom B as minimum. The break – the smallest possible record. Derived from Stone's theorem: the generator of time evolution on the axiom-derived Hilbert space has a unique self-adjoint generator with a minimum eigenvalue. That minimum is $\hbar$ (AP12).

G – the gravitational constant. Axiom R as geometry. The record – the persistence of the break in the geometry of the arena. Without this persistence, the crack heals, the symmetry restores, the now stops, records cease. Gravity is the cost the arena pays to keep the break open. Derived in this paper.

Axiom S does not produce a constant. It produces the arena's topology – the two sectors, the mirror, the stage on which the other three act. Three constants. Three axioms. One break. The mapping is one-to-one: c ↔ C (Constraint), $\hbar$ ↔ B (Break), G ↔ R (Record), topology ↔ S (Symmetry).

3 – The Faces and the Channels

AP24 (The Residual) establishes that the break ε appears in every fundamental equation. All constants are projections of one object. Six faces are identified: G (geometry), c (propagation), α_em (coupling), m_e (mass), the stiffness ratio (fabric), and time (direction). Each face is an independent reading of ε – not six different quantities that happen to be related, but one quantity read from six angles, the way one mountain has six views depending on which valley you stand in.

The arena has three spatial dimensions (AP10, derived from the axiom system – four axioms produce four independent degrees of freedom; one is time; three remain as space). Each face of ε projects across each spatial dimension. This gives 6 faces × 3 spatial dimensions = 18 independent face-projections. These are the paired channels – the 1:1 of the structure. Each channel is balanced; each has a partner on the other side of the mirror.

[A note on the time face. The six faces include time (direction), and a face is projected across the three spatial dimensions – so "time × three spatial dimensions" means the temporal reading of ε coupled to geometry in each spatial direction, not a fourth spatial axis. This is consistent with AP10's resolution of the same subtlety: time is the irreversible direction (Axiom R), and the three spatial dimensions are the arena it is read against. The projection is of a face onto a dimension; it does not promote time to a spatial coordinate.]

But the arena also contains the actualisation state – the now – which is not a spatial dimension. It is the surface from which records are written. It couples to each spatial dimension independently: possibility must connect to geometry in each of the three independent directions for a record to be written with spatial content. This gives three additional degrees of freedom: the actualisation couplings.

18 face-projections + 3 actualisation couplings = 21 independent coupling channels. This is the total number of independent paths connecting the electromagnetic face of the break to the gravitational face. Every path the signal can take from phase to curvature passes through one of these 21 channels.

4 – The Compounding

The electromagnetic coupling constant α_{em} measures the probability that the break couples to itself through one channel. One face, one dimension, one interaction. It is the strength of ε reading itself through the phase face. Numerically $\alpha_{em} \approx 1/137$ – a dimensionless ratio, no units, the probability of interaction per channel.

Now ask: what is the total coupling strength through all 21 channels simultaneously? The channels are independent – they must be, because each corresponds to a different face-projection or actualisation coupling, and the independence of the faces (AP24) and of the spatial dimensions (AP10) are derived results.

For independent channels, simultaneous coupling is multiplicative. This is not a physical assumption. It is a mathematical fact about independent events. If the probability of passing through channel 1 is p, and through channel 2 independently p, then through both it is $p \times p$. Through all 21: p^{21}.

The electromagnetic coupling is one channel: α_{em}. The gravitational coupling requires all 21 channels simultaneously – because gravity maintains the entire arena. Not one face. Not one dimension. All of them. Every room in the building. The break persists across the whole structure, or the structure collapses and the break heals. Axiom R does not permit selective persistence. The crack is open everywhere or nowhere.

Therefore the gravitational coupling through the paired channels is $\alpha_{em}^{21} \approx 1.338 \times 10^{-45}$. This is the 1:1 of the gravitational constant – the balanced structure. Twenty-one paired channels, each compounding the suppression by one power of the electromagnetic coupling.

5 – The Formal Proofs

The derivation in §3–§4 rests on five structural claims. Each is stated below as a formal proposition and proved from {S, B, R, C} and previously derived results. No external physics is imported.

Proposition 1 – Completeness of Six Faces

Statement. The break ε admits exactly six independent scalar readings. No seventh independent reading exists.

Proof. Step 1. The axiom system {S, B, R, C} produces a pre-state with independently specifiable properties. S contributes one binary degree of freedom (the two-sector structure); B one scalar (the magnitude of the break); R one directional (the irreversible arrow); C one scalar (the invariant speed bound). These four are independent by minimality (AP20 §4.2, fenced KS-P.2): no axiom is derivable from the others. Total: four independent degrees of freedom.

Step 2. The break ε instantiates Axiom B. It has a magnitude (the crack depth, which becomes mass when read as an excitation: m_e). The break sits in the arena: three independent spatial dimensions plus one time dimension (AP10), with metric structure determined by self-consistency (AP08).

Step 3. A scalar reading of ε is a map from the break to a single number, using only the arena's structure. Enumerate them. Reading 1 – Mass: the break's magnitude as the energy of the lightest stable excitation (m_e; reads B). Reading 2 – Propagation speed: the maximum signal velocity (c; reads C, as the stiffness ratio, AP03). Reading 3 – Geometric persistence: the effect on curvature (G; reads R, as the cost of persistent deformation). Reading 4 – Phase coupling: the self-interaction strength through the phase freedom (α_em; reads the probability structure, AP15). Reading 5 – Fabric stiffness: the spatial-to-temporal resistance ratio ($c^2 = \alpha/\beta$, AP03; the individual values are one degree of freedom beyond the ratio). Reading 6 – Temporal direction: the projection onto the irreversible axis (time; Axiom R as arrow, independent of G because strength and direction are independent properties of the same axiom).

Step 4. No seventh independent reading exists. The arena is a (3+1)-dimensional pseudo-Riemannian manifold with metric determined by the axioms (AP08). Any scalar observable of a field on this manifold with one gauge freedom and one irreversible direction is determined

by the field's magnitude, its metric coupling, its gauge coupling, its propagation speed, the substrate stiffness, and its temporal projection – these exhaust the independent scalar invariants. A candidate seventh reading would require a fifth axiom (violating completeness, KS-P.1), a second gauge freedom (violating AP15/AP16/AP19), or a fourth spatial dimension (violating AP10). None is available.

Therefore ε has exactly six independent scalar readings. ■ Kill switch KS-R.8a: if a seventh independent scalar reading of ε is exhibited that is not a function of the six, the completeness proof fails and the channel count changes.

Proposition 2 – Actualisation Scope

Statement. The actualisation state couples to the three spatial dimensions of the arena. It does not couple independently to the six faces of ε. The actualisation couplings number exactly 3.

Proof. Step 1. The actualisation state is the surface from which records are written (AP01, AP20). A record is a distinction inscribed into the arena – the (3+1)-dimensional manifold of AP10. Step 2. Writing a record requires specifying where in the arena the distinction is inscribed. 'Where' is a spatial specification requiring an address in three independent spatial dimensions; therefore writing a record requires coupling to each dimension independently. This gives three actualisation couplings. Step 3. The faces of ε are not locations in the arena – they are properties of the break. The actualisation state writes records into the arena using the break as the instrument of inscription. The distinction is between the page (the arena, three dimensions) and the pen (the break, six faces). The now couples to the page, not to the pen. Step 4. Adding face-couplings would double-count: the now coupling to the arena, then the arena reading the break through its faces, is already accounted for in the 18 face-projections.

Therefore the actualisation couplings number exactly 3, and the total channel count is 6 × 3 + 3 = 21. ■ Kill switch KS-R.8b: if the actualisation state is shown to couple to a degree of freedom independent of both the three spatial dimensions and the six faces, the channel count changes.

Proposition 3 – Coupling Independence

Statement. The coupling of ε through channel (i, j) – face i in dimension j – is statistically independent of the coupling through channel (k, l), for all (i, j) ≠ (k, l). The same holds for the actualisation couplings.

Proof. Statistical independence means P(A and B) = P(A) × P(B), which holds iff knowing the outcome of A gives no information about B. The six faces are independent readings (Proposition 1), so knowing one face provides no information about another: face couplings are independent for i ≠ k. The three spatial dimensions are independent (AP10, each from a different axiom face, the axioms independent by minimality): dimension couplings are independent for j ≠ l. Channel (i, j) versus channel (k, l): if i ≠ k, face independence guarantees it; if j ≠ l, dimensional independence does; the only uncovered case is i = k and j = l, the same channel. The three actualisation couplings couple to independent dimensions, hence are mutually independent; and they involve a different structural element (the now versus the break) from the face-projections, so the two families are independent of each other.

Therefore all 21 channels are mutually statistically independent. ■ Kill switch KS-R.8c: if a correlation between two channels is demonstrated that does not reduce to a shared dependence on ε itself, the independence proof fails.

Proposition 4 – Circular Cross-Section

Statement. The electron, as a topological puncture in the axiom-derived arena, has a circular cross-section. Its geometric contribution to the gravitational coupling is weighted by 1/π.

Proof. Step 1. The Lock (Edition 04) identifies the electron as the minimum viable splinter; AP04 (The Loop Hypothesis) proposes its core is a topological puncture connecting the broken and unbroken vacua. Step 2. A topological puncture in a D-dimensional manifold is a region where the field returns to the symmetric vacuum; its boundary is codimension-1. In the 3-dimensional spatial arena (AP10), a point-like defect has a 2-dimensional boundary – a closed surface surrounding the point. Step 3. The boundary shape is fixed by energy minimisation: for fixed enclosed volume, the area-minimising surface is a sphere (the isoperimetric theorem, pure mathematics). Step 4. The puncture is effectively one-dimensional (a tube connecting two topological regions); the cross-section a signal encounters is the 2-sphere boundary intersected by the tube axis – a circle. Step 5. The unpaired element couples through this circular puncture, contributing one topological winding. The geometric weight of one winding on a circle is 1/π, because the total coupling capacity of the circular boundary is π (half the circumference in normalised units – the puncture connects two sides, each contributing half the boundary). The single unpaired winding therefore contributes 1/π of the full channel coupling.

Therefore the puncture is circular and its geometric weight is 1/π. ■ Kill switch KS-R.9: if the puncture boundary is shown non-circular, the factor changes and the prediction must be recalculated.

[Note on rigour. The identification of the coupling fraction as 1/π rather than 1/2π or 1/4π depends on the normalisation of the boundary coupling. The argument is structurally motivated, and the 0.69% agreement with measurement supports the normalisation. Formal verification against the full puncture topology of AP04/AP05 is flagged as a sub-debt within the proof.]

Proposition 5 – Unit Coupling

Statement. α_em is the coupling of ε through exactly one channel. The gravitational coupling through N independent channels is α_em^N.

Proof. Step 1. The fine-structure constant α_em measures the strength of the electromagnetic interaction, which under the axioms is the force produced by the phase freedom of the pre-state (AP15) – one face of ε. Step 2. The phase freedom acts in one dimension at a time: when an electron emits or absorbs a photon, the interaction occurs at a specific point, coupling the phase to the geometry in one specific dimension. This is a single-channel coupling. Step 3. α_em is therefore the coupling strength of ε per face per dimension – per channel – not the coupling through multiple channels summed or averaged. This is why it appears in every single-vertex electromagnetic process: each vertex is one channel. Step 4. A process requiring simultaneous coupling through N independent channels has probability p^N, by the multiplication rule (Proposition 3). Step 5. Gravity requires all 21 channels (§4), so the probability is α_{em}^{21}; each power is one channel. Step 6. No fractional powers arise because each channel either couples or does not: the channels are discrete, the coupling binary, the compounding integer-power because the channel count is integer.

Therefore α_em is the one-channel coupling, and the N-channel coupling is α_em^N. ■ Kill switch KS-R.8d: if the per-channel coupling is shown to differ from α_em (e.g. if different faces have different intrinsic coupling strengths), the uniform compounding fails.

6 – The Puncture – 1×ε

The axiom does not stop at 1:1. It says 1:1 + 1×ε. Perfect balance plus one unpaired element. The electron is a topological puncture – a hole connecting the unbroken vacuum to the cracked world (AP04 The Loop Hypothesis, AP05 The Break). It is not a fragment chipped off the mirror. It is a hole punched through it. The mass of the electron is the energy cost of keeping the hole open.

This puncture has a circular cross-section (Proposition 4). It is a tube connecting two topological regions, and the natural geometric measure of a circular boundary is π. The unpaired element – the one break with no partner – couples through this circular puncture. Its contribution to the gravitational coupling is weighted by the geometry of the hole: 1/π.

The total gravitational coupling is therefore $\alpha_G = \alpha_{em}^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi)$. The first term is the 1:1 – the paired channels, the balanced structure. The second factor is the 1×ε – the unpaired element coupling through a round hole. The axiom wrote itself into the gravitational constant.

This determines the holding limit. The Lock, AP24, and AP14 write gravity as $G = 2\kappa/m_e^2$, with κ the holding limit. AP28 writes $G = \alpha_G \times \hbar c/m_e^2$. These are one equation: matching them gives $2\kappa = \alpha_{em}^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi) \times \hbar c$, i.e. $\kappa = \alpha_G \hbar c / 2$. The holding limit is not a free primitive – the channel count fixes it. What remains the architecture's one measured input is α_{em} itself; everything else, including κ and G, follows from it.

7 – The Prediction

The gravitational constant is:

$$\mathbf{G = \alpha_em^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi) \times \hbar c / m_e^2}$$

Using CODATA values for α_em, $\hbar$, c, and m_e – all known to high precision:

$$\alpha_em = 7.29735 \times 10^{-3}$$

$$\alpha_em^{21} = 1.338 \times 10^{-45}$$

$$1 + 1/\pi = 1.31831$$

$$\alpha_em^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi) = 1.764 \times 10^{-45}$$

This gives:

$$\mathbf{G_predicted = 6.721 \times 10^{-11}\ N{\cdot}m^2/kg^2}$$

The current measured value:

$$\mathbf{G_measured = 6.674 \times 10^{-11}\ N{\cdot}m^2/kg^2\ (CODATA\ 2018)}$$

Discrepancy: 0.69%.

The gravitational constant is the least precisely measured fundamental constant in physics. The CODATA uncertainty is roughly 22 parts per million, but individual experiments scatter by far more than this. Different laboratories obtain persistently different values depending on their apparatus. The reason for this scatter is unknown.

The axioms offer a structural explanation: every measurement apparatus is a leaky boundary (AP06 – the Leakage Constant). No absorber is perfect; no measurement channel is lossless. The leakage is systematic and apparatus-dependent. Different apparatuses leak differently. The experimental scatter is the leakage signature. The axiom prediction may be closer to the true value of G than current measurements are.

8 – The Hierarchy Dissolved

The hierarchy problem asks: why is gravity 10^{45} times weaker than electromagnetism? The answer: it is not weaker. It is wider.

Electromagnetism couples through one channel. A torch beam. Focused. Intense. Bright where it points. Gravity couples through twenty-one channels. The same light, filling every room in the building. Per channel, the coupling is the same. The total energy is the same. But gravity is maintaining the entire arena – every face, every dimension, every coupling of possibility to geometry – while electromagnetism is collapsing one channel into one record.

The apparent weakness is a distribution effect. A river seen from above looks thin. The water is not less. The river is wide. The ratio between them is $(1/137)^{21} \times 1.318 \approx 10^{-45}$. That ratio is not a coincidence. It is not fine-tuning. It is not a mystery. It is the number of rooms in the building. Twenty-one rooms. One break. The hierarchy is a floor plan.

9 – The Unification [Interpretive]

[Section 9 is interpretive, not derivational. The numerical result in §7 – $G = \alpha_{em}^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi) \times \hbar c/m_e^2$ – does not depend on the interpretation below. The G derivation stands independently. A reader may accept the formula and reject the interpretation without affecting any other result in the work. This section must be read slowly.]

For a century, physics has pursued the unification of its two deepest theories: quantum mechanics, governing the very small, and general relativity, governing the very large. Both are confirmed to remarkable precision. They are incompatible: the framework of one does not accommodate the other. Quantum mechanics operates on a fixed, flat stage; general relativity says the stage itself bends. Quantising the gravitational field produces infinities; curving the stage of quantum mechanics breaks the framework. Every major programme of the past fifty years – string theory, loop quantum gravity, causal sets, asymptotic safety – has been an attempt to resolve this incompatibility. No resolution.

The reason there is no resolution is that the problem is misframed. The two theories are not two systems that need to be made compatible. They are two descriptions of the same system, seen from different ends. Quantum mechanics describes the world of possibility – the space of outcomes that coexist before one becomes actual, the menu before the order is placed. General relativity describes the world of actuality – the single definite geometry that exists after the possibilities have resolved, the meal after the order is placed.

They appear incompatible because possibility and actuality look different from the inside: possibilities superpose and interfere, actualities are definite. But they are not two separate systems. They are two phases of one process – the process by which possibility becomes actual, by which the superposition collapses and one record is written. The axioms describe this process. And the derivation of G from α_{em} exhibits its structure.

Gravity is the quantum end. Gravity maintains all 21 channels simultaneously – every face, every dimension, every coupling of the now to geometry. This is what quantum mechanics describes: all degrees of freedom live, all possibilities coexisting, all paths available. Gravity is the structural mechanism that holds the space of possibilities open. Without it the arena collapses, the channels close, superposition is impossible. Gravity does not need to be 'quantised' – it IS quantum mechanics seen from the structural side.

Electromagnetism is the classical end. Electromagnetism couples through one channel – one face, one dimension, one record. This is what general relativity describes: a definite geometry, a collapsed outcome. Electromagnetism is the mechanism by which one possibility is selected from the many gravity holds open. The press stamps. The superposition resolves. One record is written. General relativity is the classical limit of the quantum process – what the world looks like after the collapse.

The measurement problem dissolves. How does quantum become classical? It is the question of how the system transitions from 21 channels to 1 – from gravity to electromagnetism, from maintaining all possibilities to collapsing one. Under the axioms this is the actualisation process: the now writes a record, which means selecting one channel and collapsing it into fact (Axiom B), irreversibly (Axiom R). The other channels remain open – maintained by gravity – until they too are collapsed by subsequent records. The measurement problem is not a problem. It is the description of the coupling shifting from distributed (gravity, all channels, quantum) to focused (electromagnetism, one channel, classical).

Quantum mechanics and general relativity looked incompatible because physicists put them side by side – two frameworks to be merged. But they are not side by side. They are end to end. Gravity is the upstream end (possibility, all channels open); electromagnetism is the downstream end (actuality, one channel selected). You do not unify upstream and downstream by building a bridge. You recognise that they are the same river. The formula exhibits it: $\alpha_G = \alpha_{em}^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi)$. The gravitational coupling IS the electromagnetic coupling, compounded through every channel the arena possesses. Not two strengths of two forces – one strength, one break, one ε, distributed differently. Spread versus focused. Quantum versus classical. It was present in $1{:}1 + 1{\times}\varepsilon$ from the beginning. They were never separate. They are two ends of one axiom.

10 – For the Reader Who Wants It in One Paragraph

Gravity holds the door open. Electromagnetism walks through it. Gravity maintains every room in the building so that anything can happen in any of them; electromagnetism picks one room and makes something happen there. Gravity is possibility. Electromagnetism is actuality. Quantum mechanics is the physics of possibility; general relativity is the physics of actuality. They looked incompatible because nobody noticed they were two ends of the same hallway. The ratio between them – 10^{45} – is the number of rooms in the building: twenty-one channels, each compounding the coupling by one factor of 1/137, plus one extra factor of 1/π for the round hole the electron holds open. That is the hierarchy. That is the unification. One building. One break. One axiom: 1:1 + 1×ε.

11 – Kill Switches

Each kill switch in Claim / Test / Status / Recovery form. Eight switches per the Master Kill Switch Registry. One empirical (KS-R.7), seven structural.

KS-R.7 — G prediction

Claim. The predicted $G = \alpha_{em}^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi) \times \hbar c/m_e^2$ must agree with the measured gravitational constant within 1%, or within the leakage correction (AP06).

Test. Compare the prediction to precision measurements of G. Current discrepancy: 0.69%.

Status. LIVE — EMPIRICAL. Fires if future precision measurements exceed 1% discrepancy and the leakage correction cannot account for it.

Recovery. If KS-R.7 fires beyond the leakage correction, the counting argument's output is wrong: the channel count, the puncture factor, or the compounding law must be re-examined. The constants tripod (c, $\hbar$) is unaffected.

KS-R.8 — Channel count

Claim. The exponent 21 is derived from six faces (AP24) across three spatial dimensions (AP10) plus three actualisation couplings.

Test. Re-derive the channel count from the faces and dimensions. Fires if the number of independent coupling channels is shown to be other than 21.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL. The count rests on Propositions 1 and 2.

Recovery. If the count differs, the exponent on α_{em} changes and the prediction shifts. The form of the argument (multiplicative compounding of independent channels) survives; the value does not.

KS-R.8a — Face completeness

Claim. ε has exactly six independent scalar readings (Proposition 1).

Test. Exhibit a seventh independent scalar reading of ε that is not a function of the six.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL. Proposition 1 proves completeness by three-case exhaustion (no fifth axiom, no second gauge freedom, no fourth dimension).

Recovery. If a seventh reading exists, the face count rises, the channel count rises, and the exponent on α_em increases – predicting a smaller G. Recoverable by recomputation.

KS-R.8b — Actualisation scope

Claim. The actualisation state couples to the three spatial dimensions, not independently to the six faces; the actualisation couplings number exactly 3 (Proposition 2).

Test. Show the actualisation state coupling to a degree of freedom independent of both the three dimensions and the six faces.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. If the actualisation scope is larger, the additional couplings raise the channel count and shift the prediction. Recoverable by recomputation.

KS-R.8c — Channel independence

Claim. All 21 channels are mutually statistically independent (Proposition 3).

Test. Demonstrate a correlation between two channels that does not reduce to a shared dependence on ε itself.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. If channels are correlated, the compounding is no longer a clean product of independent probabilities; the multiplicative law α_em^{21} must be replaced by a correlated calculation. The picture survives; the simple exponent does not.

KS-R.8d — Uniform coupling

Claim. The per-channel coupling is α_em for every channel; the N-channel coupling is α_em^N (Proposition 5).

Test. Show the per-channel coupling differs from α_em – e.g. that different faces have different intrinsic coupling strengths.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. If couplings are non-uniform, the compounding becomes a product of distinct factors rather than α_em^{21}. The counting structure survives; the single-exponent form does not.

KS-R.9 — Puncture geometry

Claim. The correction factor 1/π follows from the circular cross-section of the electron as topological puncture (Proposition 4).

Test. Show the puncture geometry is non-circular. Separately, verify the boundary-coupling normalisation (1/π versus 1/2π versus 1/4π) against the full puncture topology of AP04/AP05.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL. Carries a sub-debt: the formal normalisation of the boundary coupling. The 0.69% agreement supports 1/π.

Recovery. If the geometry is non-circular or the normalisation differs, the puncture factor changes (e.g. to 1 + 1/2π) and the prediction is recalculated. The channel-count result (§3–§4) is unaffected.

KS-R.10 — Unification structure

Claim. Gravity is the quantum end (maintaining superposition) and electromagnetism the classical end (collapsing it) – the interpretive claim of §9.

Test. Demonstrate a physical system in which gravitational coupling does NOT maintain superposition, or electromagnetic coupling does NOT collapse it.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL. Tied to the interpretive §9, which is explicitly non-derivational.

Recovery. If KS-R.10 fires, the interpretive unification of §9 fails. The G prediction (§7) is entirely unaffected – the formula does not depend on the interpretation.

12 – Dependencies

Depends on: AP03 (The Ratio – substrate stiffness, speed of light). AP04/AP05 (The Loop Hypothesis/The Break – puncture topology). AP10 (The Dimension – three spatial dimensions). AP12 (The Limit – $\hbar$ derived). AP15 (The Connection – phase freedom, electromagnetism). AP20 (The Proof – axioms hold unconditionally; EH + QRA). AP24 (The Residual – six faces of ε).

What depends on it: The ethics chain. If G is derived, the arena is fully derived; if the arena is fully derived, the actualisation state is fully derived. Within Notebook IV, AP14 (The Correction) pairs with AP28 – AP28 the value, AP14 the first quantum correction.

Dated notes

7 September 2026. Three matters of record since the lock. None alters the body above.

1. AP44 (The Snap) supplies the one factor this paper's architecture provisioned and never booked – the arena's single constitution – and realises the gravitational constant as $G = \alpha_em^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi) / (1 + \alpha_em) \times \hbar c/m_e^2 = 6.6719 \times 10^{-11}$ N·m²/kg², a residual of −0.036% against the recommended value, inside the roughly 500 ppm spread between independent laboratory determinations. §7's structural value, 6.7206×10^{-11} at +0.69%, stands beside it as the record of the omission, never in its place. The channel count, the compounding law and the puncture factor are untouched; KS-R.7 as registered here did not fire, its bar being one per cent.

2. §7's reading of the inter-laboratory scatter in measured G as the leakage signature (AP06) – offered in §0.7 as a structural explanation, testable in principle and not yet confirmed – is fenced by AP44's Appendix C as two switches, both of which stand LIVE — EMPIRICAL. The Master Kill Switch Registry's words, quoted: KS-CCC.4a, "Gap-scale exclusion. No physical characterisation of the published apparatuses supports a common leakage term of order 6,900 ppm (the Appendix C meta-analysis; Tier 1 executed twice independently, outcome N in both)"; KS-CCC.4b, "Scatter structure. Residual boundary-dependence exists in the inter-laboratory scatter at AP06's honest size, order 10^2 ppm (Tier 2's blind boundary coding; Tier 1 found the structure at best marginal, p ≈ 0.06–0.2)". The marginal finding is Tier 1's; Tier 2's blind boundary coding is the test, and it has not been run. Gap-scale corrections are excluded. AP06's reading of the scatter weakens; the realised value's central claim is unaffected either way, as KS-CCC.4b provides.

11 September 2026. Six further matters of record, from the four papers locked this day (AP50–AP53). None alters the body above.

4. §4's sentence "This is not a physical assumption. It is a mathematical fact about independent events" is withdrawn. The conjunction at the neck (product over sum) and the completed exchange (α, not a single vertex) go in. The worth α is named as the identification (AP50 §5).

5. §5, Proposition 4: Steps 2 to 4 are superseded. The neck is not a puncture through the actualised side; it is a ring, by ruling. The conclusion stands on AP50 §2, with its debt paid.

6. §0.7, §5 (the note under Proposition 4), KS-R.9 and the conditionality footer: "the 0.69% agreement supports it" is withdrawn at each locus. The sub-debt is paid on the identity of the neck with the grain and the grain's radius as the unit. The elimination table of AP50 §2 is entered beside it as record, its order disclosed.

7. §5, Proposition 1, Reading 5: $c^2 = \alpha/\beta$ is corrected to $c^2 = \beta/\alpha$.

8. §6: "the one measured input is α_em itself" is narrowed to one measured dimensionless input.

9. KS-R.8b, KS-R.8c and KS-R.8d are sharpened, as the Master Kill Switch Registry v5.31 prints them.

Claim Summary

Section-by-section structural status, with epistemic-status labels.

§2 – Three constants, three axioms. – c ↔ C, $\hbar$ ↔ B, G ↔ R, topology ↔ S. ESTABLISHED.

§3 – Channel count. – 21 = 6 faces (AP24) × 3 dimensions (AP10) + 3 actualisation couplings. DERIVED (Propositions 1, 2).

§4 – Compounding. – Independent channels multiply: α_em^{21}. DERIVED (Propositions 3, 5).

§5 – Five propositions. – Completeness, scope, independence, circular cross-section, unit coupling. PROVED; 1/π normalisation is a SUB-DEBT.

§6 – Puncture factor. – $\alpha_G = \alpha_em^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi)$. DERIVED, conditional on the P4 normalisation.

§7 – Prediction. – $G = 6.721 \times 10^{-11}$; measured 6.674×10^{-11}; discrepancy 0.69%. EMPIRICAL (KS-R.7).

§8 – Hierarchy dissolved. – The 10^{45} ratio is the channel count, not fine-tuning. STRUCTURAL CONSEQUENCE.

§9 – Unification. – QM and GR as two ends of the actualisation process. INTERPRETIVE – NON-DERIVATIONAL.

§11 – Kill switches. – KS-R.7 (empirical) + KS-R.8/8a/8b/8c/8d/9/10 (structural).

Conditionality Footer

Dependencies

AP03 (c). AP04/AP05 (puncture topology). AP10 (three spatial dimensions). AP12 ($\hbar$). AP15 (α_em as per-channel coupling). AP24 (six faces of ε). AP20 (EH + QRA proved). AP28 is unconditional on EH and QRA.

Dependents

The ethics chain: a fully derived G completes the arena, and a fully derived arena completes the actualisation state. Within Notebook IV, AP14 (the first quantum correction to G).

Kill switches engaged

KS-R.7 (G prediction, LIVE — EMPIRICAL). KS-R.8 (channel count), KS-R.8a (face completeness), KS-R.8b (actualisation scope), KS-R.8c (channel independence), KS-R.8d (uniform coupling), KS-R.9 (puncture geometry), KS-R.10 (unification structure) — all LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Structural debts owed

Sub-debt under KS-R.9 – the formal normalisation of the boundary coupling (1/π versus 1/2π versus 1/4π) against the full puncture topology of AP04/AP05. The single quantitative debt of AP28; the 0.69% agreement supports 1/π.

Items held open without claiming debt status

The interpretive unification (§9) – non-derivational, tested by KS-R.10, with the G prediction independent of it. The leakage explanation of inter-laboratory scatter in measured G (§7) – a structural explanation, not yet confirmed.

Notation Reference

All symbols used in AP28, with structural source and disambiguation.

{S, B, R, C} – The four axioms of Notebook I. Independent (AP20 §4.2, fenced KS-P.2).

1:1 + 1×ε – The axiom. Perfect balance (1:1) plus one unpaired element (1×ε, the electron).

ε – The break (Axiom B), identified with the electron (The Lock), modelled as a topological puncture (AP04/AP05).

α_em – The fine-structure constant ≈ 1/137.036. The per-channel coupling – the probability that ε couples to itself through one channel.

α_G – The gravitational coupling, $\alpha_em^{21} \times (1 + 1/\pi)$. The break read as geometry across all 21 channels.

G – Newton's gravitational constant. $G = \alpha_G \times \hbar c/m_e^2$ (the prediction of §7).

c – The speed of light. $c = \sqrt{(\beta/\alpha)}$ (AP03). Axiom C as speed.

ℏ – The Planck constant. The minimum eigenvalue of the time-evolution generator (Stone, AP12). Axiom B as minimum.

m_e – The electron mass. The break read as the energy of the lightest stable excitation.

α, β – Temporal and spatial substrate stiffness (AP03). Their ratio gives c^2. NOT the fine-structure constant.

κ – The holding limit (The Lock).

π – The geometric measure of the circular puncture boundary (Proposition 4). The 1/π factor is one winding's weight.

channel – An independent coupling path from the electromagnetic to the gravitational face: a face-projection (i, j) or an actualisation coupling. There are 21.

face – An independent scalar reading of ε (AP24). There are six: G, c, α_em, m_e, stiffness ratio, time.

actualisation state – The now – the surface from which records are written (AP01, AP20). Couples to the three spatial dimensions, not to the faces (Proposition 2).

18 face-projections – 6 faces × 3 spatial dimensions (AP10). The paired channels – the 1:1 of the structure.

3 actualisation couplings – The now coupling to each of the three spatial dimensions. The additional degrees of freedom beyond the 18 face-projections.

21 – The total channel count: 18 + 3. The exponent on α_em. The number of rooms in the building (KS-R.8).

topological puncture – The electron's core – a tube connecting the broken and unbroken vacua (AP04/AP05). Circular cross-section (Proposition 4).

AP03 (The Ratio) – Derives c from the substrate stiffness ratio.

AP10 (The Dimension) – Derives three spatial dimensions from the four axioms.

AP12 (The Limit) – Derives $\hbar$ from Stone's theorem.

AP15 (The Connection) – Derives electromagnetism from phase freedom; α_em as the per-channel coupling.

AP24 (The Residual) – Establishes the six independent faces of ε.

AP20 (The Proof) – EH and QRA proved; the axioms hold unconditionally.

CODATA 2018 – The source of the measured input values (α_em, $\hbar$, c, m_e) and the measured G = 6.674×10^{-11}.

This work is published for free, forever.

Don’t be a cunt. Be kind.

the420code.org

Series	The 420 Code
Catalogue	Ø Artist’s Proofs
Proof Number	AP28
Title	The Constant
Subtitle	Forces and Constants
Medium	Physics
Artist	G
Version	1.2 · 2026.11.27

This work is Copyleft. You are free to download, print, share, and distribute. You are not free to alter the source. Keep the signal clean.

STUDIO 6